

APPLICANT(S): KRUGER et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/565,933  
FILED: January 20, 2006  
Page 6

#### REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### Status of Claims

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9 and 12 have been objected to. Claims 1-14 have been rejected. Claims 1, 3-14 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

#### Remarks to the Abstract

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Abstract because it exceeds 150 words of length, and for an alleged informality. The Abstract has been replaced with a shorter Abstract to cure the informality.

Applicants respectfully assert that the replacement abstract adds no new matter.

#### Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 4, 5, 9 and 12 because of alleged informalities. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9 and 12 have been amended in order to cure these informalities. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the objection.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 08 2009

APPLICANT(S): KRUGER et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/565,933  
FILED: January 20, 2006  
Page 7

**CLAIM REJECTIONS****35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the light" in Line 2. Claim 4 has been amended to correct this deficiency.

It is respectfully asserted that the foregoing amendment merely addresses matters of form and does not change the literal scope of the claim in any way or result in any prosecution history estoppel.

Applicants respectfully assert that these amendments render claim 4 proper under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Koike *et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Koike *et al.* disclose a "low frequency Langevin transducer" (an acoustic transducer) that "produces the cavitation bubbles in the flow" (Abstract). Koike *et al.* does not teach or suggest "a cavitation unit comprising a cavitation light laser source for generating cavitation bubbles" as recited in amended independent claim 1. Nor does Koike *et al.* teach or suggest "using a cavitation light laser source to generate cavitation bubbles" as recited in amended independent claim 13. For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose all elements of the claim. Therefore, Koike *et al.* cannot anticipate claims 1 and 13, as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 3-4 depend directly from claim 1, and therefore includes all the limitations of that claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3-4 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claims 1 and 13 and to claims 3-4 dependent thereon.

APPLICANT(S): KRUGER et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/565,933  
FILED: January 20, 2006  
Page 8

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5-9, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Kittrell *et al.* (US 2002/0045811 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner did not reject claim 1 over Kittrell *et al.*, and, as discussed above, amended independent claim 1 is allowable over Koike *et al.* Claims 5-9, 11 and 14 have now been amended to depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and therefore include all the limitations of that claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5-9, 11 and 14 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended dependent claims 5-9, 11 and 14.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Tanaka *et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner did not reject claim 1 over Tanaka *et al.*, and, as discussed above, amended independent claim 1 is allowable over Koike *et al.* Claims 5 and 10 have now been amended to depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and therefore include all the limitations of that claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5 and 10 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended dependent claims 5 and 10.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-11 and 13-14.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Kittrell *et al.* in view of Levy (US 5116227).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 12 under Kittrell *et al.* in view of Levy.

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claim 1 is allowable over Koike *et al.* Claim 12 now depends indirectly from claim 1, and therefore

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 08 2009


APPLICANT(S): KRUGER et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/565,933  
FILED: January 20, 2006  
Page 9

includes all the limitations of that claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 12 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended dependent claim 12.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Brian L. Wamsley  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 33,045

for Christopher M. Ries, Reg. No. 45,799  
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
345 Scarborough Road  
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510  
Telephone: 914-333-9632  
Facsimile: 914-332-0615

Dated: January 8, 2009